Post-2020 indicator framework – Roma equality and inclusion
Concept paper for the workshop on future policies for Roma
1 October 2019

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights

Contents

Introduction

Robust and policy-relevant indicators are essential for monitoring progress and evaluating results of interventions. The paper provides suggestions for an indicator framework to measure progress on Roma[1] inclusion post-2020.

In line with the 2011 Commission Communication on an EU Framework on National Roma Integration Strategies,[2] each EU Member State developed its own National Roma Integration Strategy (or integrated sets of policy measures). The European Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) regularly provides data and background information for the Commission's annual reporting to the European Parliament and to the Council on progress in the integration of the Roma populations in EU Member States.

The 2011 Commission Communication notes that progress in Roma integration should be monitored and therefore measured through common, comparable and reliable indicators. Such indicators should help Member States to assess their **progress towards closing the Roma – non-Roma gap** in access to education, employment, health and other public and private services (including housing), in order to reach the overall (education, employment and poverty reduction) targets of the Europe 2020 strategy. In December 2013, the Council of Ministers issued a Council Recommendation on effective Roma integration measures in the Member States.[3] It outlines the steps forward that the Member States should take to ensure meeting the objectives of the National Roma Integration Strategies (NRIS).

The European Commission's report on the implementation of the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies, published in April 2014, uses data from FRA's Roma survey 2011 and refers to it as "the starting point from which progress is measured." Using 2011 as a baseline, the European Commission issued a Staff Working Document "Roma integration indicators scoreboard (2011-2016)" accompanying the 2017 Midterm review of the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies[4].

The Commission's 2019 report on the implementation of national Roma integration strategies completes the picture with a focus on national implementation of Roma inclusion measures. FRA contributed to the development of this report by assisting:

- Member States to report on the implementation of integration measures;

- the Commission in its monitoring role as part of the EU framework for NRIS.

---

[1] The term "Roma and Travellers" is used as an umbrella term defined by Council of Europe. It refers to "Roma, Sinti, Kale and related groups in Europe, including Travellers and the Eastern groups (Dom and Lom). It covers the wide range of groups concerned, including persons who identify themselves as "Gypsies". Roma and Travellers are one of the largest ethnic minority groups in the EU, with an estimated 10-12 million people in Europe. FRA places special emphasis on the Human Rights based principle of self-identificationin the design and implementation of its Roma surveys.. See https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/HRIndicators/GuidanceNoteonApproachtoData.pdf

[2] An EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020, COM(2011) 173/4

[3] Council Recommendation of 9 December 2013 on effective Roma integration measures in the Member States (2013/C 378/01).

[4] Roma integration indicators scoreboard (2011-2016) accompanying the document Communication to the European Parliament and the Council, Midterm review of the EU framework for national Roma integration strategies

FRA survey data on the situation of Roma in education, employment, healthcare, housing, and experience of discrimination and poverty helped to put in context the reviewed Roma inclusion efforts and highlight remaining challenges and gaps[5].

In 2016, the European Court of Auditors Special Report on EU Policy Initiatives and Financial Support for Roma integration[6] recommended the development of adequate methodologies to collect relevant data on Roma inclusion in all Member States. In 2017, the European Commission launched a consultation process for the mid-term evaluation of the EU Framework for national Roma integration strategies. FRA's regular data collection activities, such as the second EU-MIDIS survey from 2016, supported the evaluation.

The Commission's 2018 Communication[7] went further suggesting that successful Roma integration strategies at both European and national level need to be comprehensive and, apart from the key fields of education, employment, health, housing and poverty, they should address anti-Gypsyism. In its resolution of February 2019,[8] the European Parliament also stresses the importance of strengthening the post-2020 Strategic EU Framework for National Roma Inclusion Strategies and focusing on the fight against anti-Gypsyism. [9] Monitoring progress in Roma inclusion will be an essential element in ensuring full compliance with the enabling conditions of the European Structural Investment Funds during their next programming period.

1. Structure-Process-Outcome indicators framework

The preamble of the 2013 Council Recommendation recalls that many Roma in the Union still face barriers to exercising their fundamental rights and recommends effective policy measures to ensure their equal treatment and the respect of their fundamental rights. In this light, it is useful to consider a human rights based approach to monitoring compliance with the EU's Charter, of Fundamental Rights in particular as regards equal treatment and non-discrimination.

The indicator framework suggested below is based on the Structure-Process-Outcome (S-P-O) indicator model recommended by the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) when assessing compliance with human rights standards. By means of different sets of indicators and in reference to specific human rights standards, this model allows an assessment of:

a) the legal and policy framework in place (structural indicators);

b) the concrete interventions to implement it (process indicators);

c) the achievements, as experienced by the rights holders (outcome indicators).

---

[5] Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council: Report on the implementation of national Roma integration strategies,COM(2019) 406 final, https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/report-implementation-national-roma-integration-strategies-2019_en

[6] European Court of Auditors, (2016) No.14. Available at: http://www.eca.europa.eu/en/Pages/DocItem.aspx?did=36850.

[7] Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council: Report on the evaluation of the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020 COM (2018) 785 final {SWD(2018) 480 final}, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1544112037077&uri=CELEX:52018DC0785

[8] European Parliament (2019), Resolution of 12 February 2019 on the need for a strengthened post-2020 Strategic EU Framework for National Roma Inclusion Strategies and stepping up the fight against anti-Gypsyism (2019/2509(RSP)), P8_TA(2019)0075, Strasbourg, 12 February 2019.

[9] A small change but substantial shift in its conceptual approach, is the focus on inclusion rather than integration. Whereas integration postulates a process of moving into the existing mainstream society, inclusion involves a process of systematic reform of structural change to overcome barriers and providing all persons equal access and participation. This is in line with the overall EU social inclusion policies.

Structure: EU and national legal frameworks and strategies that are put in place to comply with the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (in the case of Roma, the EU Framework for National Roma integration strategies)

Process: The specific interventions and actions (e.g. programmes, projects, measures) put in place to achieve the goals and targets of the national Roma strategy by implementing the legal and policy provisions mentioned.

Outcomes or results: The situation on the ground and any changes in the enjoyment of fundamental rights of individuals with specific characteristics, such as ethnic origin in the case of Roma. These are mostly standard indicators, populated by data, which ideally could be disaggregated according to different categories of ethnic origin, sex and age. In Member States where no such data are available socio-economic data could be used as proxy. The indicators should be in line with the Europe 2020 or any post-2020 EU indicators of poverty or social exclusion.

The indicators presented in this paper address the second and the third level of the S-P-O framework, since formal compliance of national legislation with EU primary and secondary law is the exclusive prerogative of the Commission.

2. Process indicators: lessons of the 2018 reporting cycle and areas for possible improvement

In 2017, the European Commission introduced an online tool for facilitating the annual reporting of the Member States on the measures they take to comply with the Council Recommendation of 2013 on Roma integration. The main objective of the tool was to provide data and information on Roma inclusion measures implemented by Member States and their results. The online tool was developed in close collaboration with the Commission and Member States participating in the Working party on Roma integration indicators - coordinated by FRA between 2013 and 2016.

In the 2018 reporting cycle, 23 Member States populated the process indicators included in this reporting tool with relevant data and information. These indicators were used in the Commission's Staff Working Document and its accompanying Country Summaries.[10] The proposed list of indicators in Table 1 builds on the experience from this reporting cycle. It should be noted, however, that the reporting exercise also revealed a range of challenges that should be addressed:

Definition of "Roma" benefitting from the specific measures
Identifying Roma is challenging. Surveys or censuses can use self-identification but it is practically impossible – and potentially politically not desirable – to identify the ethnic background of those who benefit from large-scale systemic interventions or strategic horizontal programs, as these rarely track their beneficiaries' ethnic origin. On the other hand, measures targeting Roma explicitly, as shown in a number of countries during the 2018 reporting cycle, should be able to find ways of identifying the individuals they target, namely Roma.

For the next reporting cycle, it is advisable to monitor the number of Roma beneficiaries only for specific measures (i.e. measures explicitly targeting Roma), because it is not possible to determine the number of those benefitting from mainstream or horizontal measures. Moreover, it would be

---

[10] SWD (2019) 320; https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/report-implementation-national-roma-integration-strategies-2019_en

useful for Member States to share information on the methodologies they employ to include individual Roma in explicitly targeted actions.

Different scope of the reported measures (distinguishing between strategic programs and small-scale interventions):

Member states used different definitions of a "measure" – most probably, following the national legislation or implementing regulations. In some cases, these were small-scale, local interventions with funding in the range of several thousand EUR. In other cases, these were big programs of national coverage with funding in the range of tens of million EUR. Obviously, information and data on units of reporting so diverse is not comparable and a certain degree of harmonisation is advisable.

For the next reporting cycle consideration should be given as to whether Member States should report on their big-scale strategic programs of national coverage separately from small-scale specific "measures" (selecting perhaps an illustrative number rather than an exhaustive list) to achieve better comparability between measures and countries.

Financial resources allocation:

Data on financial resource allocation is fragmented. This type of information was only reliable and robust for small, targeted measures. Funds for social protection or other horizontal social inclusion measures cannot be disaggregated by ethnic criteria and therefore, it is practically impossible to account for how much of the funding reached the Roma. In case of mainstream or horizontal social inclusion or poverty reduction interventions, the common practice in 2018 reporting cycle was to report the entire volume of the funding as "Roma relevant" because, as "a group particularly vulnerable to social exclusion, Roma are benefiting from the program". As a result, a multi-million programme could be "accounted" to Roma – even though the Roma may be a fraction of the country's population or may have had limited access to that particular programme.

For the next reporting cycle, it is advisable to monitor only the funding allocated to specific measures for Roma beneficiaries as it is practically impossible to account how much of the funding for horizontal measures reaches the Roma.

Accounting for the access to horizontal and mainstream measures:

In practice, mainstream measures are often the most effective for combatting poverty and social exclusion. Targeted measures may be high in numbers but minimal in scope and in their potential for change. Respectively, most of the efforts and resources for Roma inclusion are allocated for mainstream interventions with the assumption that no hidden barriers in accessing mainstream measures exist and these measures are equally accessible to any person in vulnerable situation regardless of her or his ethnicity, sex or age among others. In reality, however, various implicit barriers do exist and the nominal eligibility does not automatically translate into real access, making it more difficult for Roma to exercise their rights as citizens of the respective Member State.

This would entail collecting and reporting more information on the specific measures (safeguards) aiming to overcome such obstacles and to identify any implicit or explicit barriers Roma may face when accessing measures. Reporting on the safeguards that might open or ease access to mainstream social inclusion measures for the Roma could be a useful process indicator of Roma inclusion.

For the next reporting cycle, it would be advisable to focus on the explicit and implicit barriers Roma may face in accessing horizontal measures and any safeguards in place to compensate for such barriers limiting the access.

Establishing a link between "process" and "outcome".

Ideally, interventions should yield a measurable output and such outputs should result in tangible outcomes. In reality however, it is difficult to establish a direct link between the processes (with their inputs and outputs reported by the Member States) and the outcomes (captured through data collected in surveys or administrative data). Various factors beyond the measurable outputs can have impact on the outcomes. It is possible, however, to capture at least the awareness of Roma about some flagship policy measures that have been implemented. Such indicators could be used, for example, as a proxy of the degree to which reported measures, policies and "processes" in a country actually reach the people whose situation they are expected to improve.

For the next reporting cycles, it is advisable to collect data on Roma people's level of awareness about such interventions or policies to obtain approximation on the effectiveness of large scale interventions (not as part of the NRCP reporting but as part of FRA's surveys).

Engaging the stakeholders implementing the measures

The 2018 reporting cycle proved the value of in-depth analysis of the reported data. This was done in two domains. One was the distribution of measures in the respective thematic areas by thematic sub-areas (as defined in the Council Recommendation). The second was the distribution of measures in the respective thematic areas by substantive focus of the measures based on content analysis of the measures' descriptions. Both approaches provided important insights into the Roma inclusion process providing more details on what was actually done (and what the resources might have been devoted to). It also helped to check the validity and the comprehensiveness of the thematic sub-areas set out in the recommendation, and thus will help to propose revisions to the tool and to define future process indicators and to develop the revised Council Recommendation.

More detailed information on what a measure actually did could enrich the picture of the Roma inclusion process, but it would increase the complexity of the exercise. It is advisable to select a very small number of significant measures in each domain and collect more detailed information by those implementing it and relevant stakeholders, e.g. civil society actors, to verify the information.

For the next reporting cycle, a small number of selected measures could be examined in more depth engaging practitioners and stakeholders involved in order to achieve a better understanding of the actual operation and impact of the particular measure.

3. Process indicators for the post-2020 Roma inclusion monitoring framework

The *process indicators* and analysis of the reported measures considered in this paper are a valuable contribution to the analysis of the effectiveness of concrete interventions on the ground. Such "process" indicators were tested in the 2018 reporting cycle. They capture inputs (allocated resources) and outputs (the results that the specific measures should yield to reach the predetermined outcome).

The reporting tool provided information for some process indicators based on the experiences from the last two reporting cycles (with a focus on 2018) as listed in table 1 below. Applying the online tool for collecting information on Member States' measures in response to the 2013 Council

Recommendation highlighted the broad diversity between countries in regards feasibility of collecting such data, the validity and quality of information reported. This is the reason why at this point no input indicators were derived from the reporting tool (e.g. funding allocated by thematic areas, data on which is fragmented and potentially misleading). Similarly, some output indicators (e.g. number of Roma beneficiaries) appear not feasible at the moment. Such indicators however might be developed in the future as secondary indicators of the reporting on Roma integration measures is harmonised with Managing Authorities' reporting under ESIFs.

Thus, the current list is a compromise, which seems feasible at this point in time, provided the caveats illustrated above. If definitions and input reported can be improved, such indicators might be expanded for future reporting periods. In particular, if adopted, it would enable determining:

a) the **scale of interventions** individual Member States undertake to address Roma inclusion (policy, project, individual activity), their **scope** (nation-wide, regional, local) and continuity (regularly implemented or one -off intervention);
b) **type of approaches** the Member States use to address Roma inclusion (targeted interventions or mainstream interventions);
c) the specific **safeguards** Member States provide for ensuring that Roma have equal access to mainstream interventions addressing poverty and social exclusion;
d) specific details of the **targeted interventions** for which the Roma beneficiaries could be identified (e.g. funds allocated, number of Roma beneficiaries);
e) **substantive content** of interventions (what was actually done) – clustering the interventions along the typology suggested in the Council Recommendation of 2013 and any subsequent potential revision).

Some of the proposed outcome indicators populated with data from FRA Roma surveys can also serve as process indicators, as a check on the awareness and the reach of support programs in individual areas (Table 2). They could provide information on the extent to which big-scale interventions are reaching the Roma. Based on the share of Roma who have benefitted from such measures, a crude proxy of the number of beneficiaries of those interventions reported by NRCPs for a given country might be derived.

Table 1: Selected analysis and process indicators based on the 2017 & 2018 reporting cycle on national Roma integration strategies

Title	Used in	Possible adaptations	Rationale
Share of Roma integration interventions implemented in given year as reported by MSs (distribution by various types of interventions using the typology in the reporting tool)[1]	NEW	Requires precise definition of the "intervention" and defining various groupings/types of "interventions" along three dimensions: _Territorial scope:_ • National – Regional – Local _Scale:_ • policy – programme – individual measure _Continuity_ • regularly/continuously implemented – one -off intervention	Showing whether Roma integration is addressed in a systemic way or via non-systemic interventions that are being implemented because of (external) funding availability (e.g. ESIF)
Share of Roma integration interventions implemented in given year as reported by MSs (mainstream v. targeted) [1]	2019 SWD (Figure 1)	Requires adjustment of reporting tool – definition of the "intervention" (as opposed to currently used "measure") as well as the definitions of mainstream and targeted.	Showing the prevailing approach of MSs to address the Roma inclusion – through mainstream or targeted interventions
Share of reported mainstream interventions with additional safeguards to make them accessible for vulnerable groups such as Roma[1]	2019 SWD (Figure 3)	Could go into more details regarding the type of safeguard, resources allocated, continuity (one-off or systemic)	Showing the level of commitment of MS to address specific needs of vulnerable groups via mainstream interventions
Number of reported targeted interventions with identifiable Roma as final beneficiaries[1]	2019 SWD (Figure 2)		Showing if the systems for monitoring NRIS are set up and functioning (if yes, MSs should be able to identify how many beneficiaries benefit from targeted interventions focusing on Roma)
Distribution of interventions by relevance to the respective sub-areas of the Council Recommendation[1,2]	2019 SWD (Table 4, Table 8, Table 12, Table 16, Table 20, Table 24)	Requires adjustment of the reporting tool – to be able to mark the area of primary relevance and the areas of secondary/tertiary relevance. As a rule of thumb the "primary" one is the area of the operational programme (or Ministry in case of non-EU funded intervention) under which the funding comes from.	Shows which activities defined in the policy framework (Council Recommendation) are relevant and/or used in a given MS In case new policy framework approved it can be used as a basis.

Distribution of interventions in the area by substantive focus of activity[1,2]	2019 SWD (Table 5, Table 9, Table 13, Table 17, Table 21, Table 25,)	- Requires analytical input external to the reporting tool - Types of activity could be predefined upon agreement of stakeholders or they could be set up based on the reports from MSs - If not pre-defined, comparability across years could be limited	Shows which types of activity are used to address Roma integration (i.e. what exactly the MSs are doing - groupings of interventions by substance)
[1] Indicators populated at the level of all priority areas as well as at the level of individual priority are (access to education, access to employment, access to healthcare, access to housing, anti-discrimination, poverty reduction through social investment, protection of Roma children and women, empowerment) [2] Only one of these two indicators to be selected			

4. Outcome indicators for the post-2020 Roma inclusion monitoring framework

The proposal for indicators follows the policy areas as laid out in the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020, the Commission Staff Working Document (SWD) 2019[11] and took into consideration the guidelines for the development of EU inclusion indicators[12]:

1) The portfolio of indicators should be balanced across different dimensions
2) Indicators should be mutually consistent and the weight of a single indicator in the portfolio should be proportionate
3) The portfolio of indicators should be as transparent and accessible as possible to EU citizens

For the individual indicators:

1) An indicator should capture the essence of the problem and have a clear and accepted normative interpretation (i.e. should be agreed on by stakeholders, experts, countries, politics)
2) An indicator should be robust and statistically validated
3) An indicator should be responsive to policy interventions but not subject to manipulation
4) An indicator should be measurable in a sufficiently comparable way across Member States and comparable as far as practicable with the standards applied internationally
5) An indicator should be timely and susceptible to revision
6) The measurement of an indicator should not impose too large burden on Member States, on enterprise, nor on the Union's citizens

The list of indicators proposed below builds on the Roma integration indicators scoreboard (2011-2016) to which a number of existing indicators (published in the SWD 2019) are added and new ones are suggested. Some of the proposed indicators remain to be tested and some indicators still need development in future data collections. Priority is given to indicators, which allow comparisons with the general population. All available survey data were screened for its usability to contribute to such indicator frame and discussed between FRA and the Commission. A total of 71 indicators were tested and selected based on reliability and validity for further statistical analysis and data collections. Out of those 55 were identified meeting the criteria as outlined above.

The proposed list of indicators should reflect the general objective for a post 2020 Roma inclusion framework combatting discrimination and socio-economic exclusion of the Roma. The specific objectives are to reduce antigypsyism and discrimination and to promote effective access of the Roma to quality education, employment, healthcare, housing and essential services, and to reduce poverty.

Antigypsism is a specific form of racism towards Roma, Sinti, Travellers and others who are stigmatised in the perception of gypsies in the public imagination[13]. Using outcome indicators on the situation of the Roma and the Travellers can however only reflect the manifestation of antigypsyism and not the root causes, which have to be addressed as an integral part of all thematic areas and policy responses. The

---

[11]https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/cswd_roma_inclusion_measures_reported_under_the_eu_framework_for_nris_pt1_en.pdf

[12] Atkinson T.,et. al. 2002: Social Indicators: The EU and Social Inclusion. http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/0199253498.001.0001/acprof-9780199253494

[13] http://antigypsyism.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Antigypsyism-reference-paper-16.06.2017.pdf

indicator framework suggests for the first time to include anti-Roma and anti-Gypsy resentments among the general population.

The aim is to have headline indicators (*primary indicators*), one or two for each area, and some additional indicators per area (secondary indicators). Headline indicators should capture the essence of the thematic area and ideally be linked to a benchmark or policy target. Headline indicators should be complemented with *secondary indicators* to provide additional information for the primary indicator or could be used as replacement, in case the primary indicator is not available or feasible. Headline indicators should be the minimum set all countries agree upon and collect data for monitoring progress and reaching the set targets. Furthermore, countries are encouraged to develop national *tertiary indicators*, to address country specific challenges and targets of Roma inclusion. Countries should be supported in taking up their own data collections. In this regard, indicators should be set up and designed in a way to allow for output harmonisation.[14] This is in line with the EU indicator system, with a few exceptions in the area of health, which require input harmonised questionnaires. The final set of indicators is also subject to the availability of the data. Currently, several data collections serve for this proposal: Main data sources on the Roma are the FRA's Second European Minorities and Discrimination survey (2016) and the upcoming FRA's Roma and Travellers survey 2019 (not published yet). The indicators for the general population are based on the FRA's Fundamental Rights Survey 2019 (not published yet) and the upcoming special Eurobarometer 2019 (493) on Discrimination in the European Union (not published yet).

Member States are encouraged to start their own data collections with active involvement of their National Statistical Offices to populate relevant outcome indicators on monitoring of progress of national Roma inclusion strategies. Examples of such data collections are Slovakia and Bulgaria who are currently exploring administrative and survey data to populate the indicators.

In the absence of national data collections, the Commission requested FRA to provide data that will serve as a baseline for the post-2020 EU Roma indicator framework. The Roma and Travellers survey 2019 in six EU Member States will serve as data source and a new data collection on Roma in another 11 Member States is planned for 2020[15]. A final set of indicators for the post-2020 framework for monitoring progress on Roma inclusion will depend on the availability and feasibility to collect these data.

The proposed set of indicators as outlined below covers 7 areas: (1) Education (2) Employment (3) Health (4) Housing (5) Poverty (6) Discrimination and Hate crime and (7) Rights awareness and trust in public institutions.

If feasible and when the population size allows, all indicators should be disaggregated by gender and age. Subject of data availability is further disaggregation on limitation in activities, which is often used as a proxy for disability.

---

[14] Indicators which are output harmonised can be populated from different data sources and obtained through country specific questions but have to follow the same definition. An example are education classifications. National specific educational systems are harmonised ex-post following the same definition of the international ISCED classification. Some questions are sensitive to the type of data collection or how a question is asked. To reach comparability methodology and questionnaires are ex-ante harmonised (Input harmonisation).

[15] Roma and Travellers survey was implemented in: BE, FR, IE, NL, SE and the UK. An upcoming data collection on Roma could cover: CZ, EL, ES, HR, HU, IT, PT, RO, SK, MK and RS.

Table 2: Roma integration outcome indicators post-2020 framework

	Area	Indicator	Headline or secondary indicator	Published in	Comparable
1.1.	Education	Share of Roma children in the age between 3 years and compulsory school who attend early childhood education, household members (%)	1	Scoreboard	EU Joint Assessment Framework
1.2.	Education	Share of compulsory-schooling-age Roma children attending education, household members, 5-17 (depending on the country) (%)	2	Scoreboard	
1.3.	Education	Early leavers from education and training, household members, 18-24 (%)	1	Scoreboard	Europe 2020
1.4.	Education	Share of Roma who felt discriminated against because of being Roma in the past 12 months, when in contact with school authorities (as a parent/guardian or a student) in the past 12 months, respondents, 16+ (%)	2	Scoreboard	SDG relevant
1.5.	Education	Share of Roma children, 6-15 years old, attending schools where 'all or most of schoolmates are Roma' as reported by the respondents, household members 6-15 in education (%)	1	Scoreboard	
1.8.	Education	Share of Roma aged who have completed tertiary education (%)	2	NEW	Europe 2020
1.10.	Education	Roma living in households with children who have received support in schooling of children	2	NEW	Outcome/process
1.11.	Education	Prevalence of hate-motivated bullying/harassment of Roma children while in school in the past 12 months, out of all respondents who are parents/guardians of school-age children, respondents, 16+ (%)	2	SWD	
2.1.	Employment	Share of Roma people who self-declared their main activity status as 'paid work' (including full-time, part-time, ad hoc jobs, self-employment and occasional work or work in the past four weeks), household members, 20-64 years (%)	1	Scoreboard	LFS, EU/SILC
2.2.	Employment	Share of young persons, 16-24 years old with current main activity 'neither in employment, education or training', household members (%)	1	Scoreboard	Europe 2020

2.3.	Employment	Share of Roma who felt discriminated against because of being Roma in the past 12 months, when looking for a job, respondents, 16+ (%)	1	Scoreboard	SDG relevant
2.4.	Employment	Share of Roma who felt discriminated against because of being Roma in the past 12 months, when at work, respondents, 16+ (%)	2	Scoreboard	SDG relevant
2.5.	Employment	Share of Roma aged 0-59 years living in households with a current low work intensity (below 20%), household members (%)	2	SWD	Europe 2020
2.6.	Employment	Share of Roma who have not worked in the last 4 weeks and looking for work, respondents, 16-74 (%)	2	NEW	Eurostat
2.7.	Employment	Share of Roma who ever received help or support when looking for work because being a Roma (support in finding a job or training for a job / profession) from a public institution or NGO, 16+ (%)	2	NEW	Outcome/process
8.2…	Employment	Indicator to be developed on gender employment gap	2	NEW	
3.1.	Health	Share of Roma assessing their health in general as 'Very good' or 'Good', respondents, 16+ (%)	2	Scoreboard	Eurostat
3.2.	Health	Share of Roma with medical insurance coverage, respondents, 16+ (%)	1	Scoreboard	
3.3.	Health	Life Expectancy	1	NEW	structural indicator
3.6.	Health	Share of Roma households where either a respondent or HH member received help or used the support from a public institution, NGO or a health mediator when going to the doctor/hospital (the assistance of a health mediator when going to a doctor), respondents, 16+ (%)	2	NEW	Outcome/process
3.8.	Health	Share of Roma who felt discriminated against because of being Roma in the past 12 months, when accessing the health services, respondents, 16+ (%)	1	NEW	SDG relevant

4.9.	Health	Share of Roma living in households with the listed problems in their accommodation: Pollution, grime or other environmental problems in the local area such as: smoke, dust, unpleasant smells or polluted water, household members, (%)	2	SWD	Eurostat
4.1.	Housing	Share of people living in households without tap water inside the dwelling, household members (%)	1	Scoreboard	SDG relevant
4.4.	Housing	Share of people living in households having neither toilet, nor shower, nor bathroom inside the dwelling, household members (%)	2	Scoreboard	Eurostat
4.5.	Housing	Share of people who felt discriminated against because of being Roma in the past 5 years, when looking for housing, respondents, 16+ (%)	1	Scoreboard	SDG relevant
4.6.	Housing	Share of Roma living in household that does not have the minimum number of rooms according to the Eurostat definition of overcrowding (household members, %) - OVERCROWDING	1	SWD	Eurostat
4.7.	Housing	Share of Roma living in severe housing deprivation in %: living in an apartment too dark, leaking roof, no bath/shower, no indoor toilet, dwelling considered too dark	1	NEW	Eurostat
4.12.	Housing	Share of people living in household that in the past 12 months has ever been forced to leave the accommodation or halting site, household members, (%) - EVICTIONS	2	NEW	Eurostat
4.13.	Housing	Share of people who received help or support from a public institution or NGO in finding a place to stay because being a Roma, respondents, 16+ (%)	2	NEW	Outcome/process
4.14	Housing	Precarious housing (homelessness) - to be added as new indicator	2	NEW	
5.1.	Poverty	At-risk-of poverty rate (below 60% of median equivalised income after social transfers), household members (%)	1	Scoreboard	Europe 2020
5.2.	Poverty	Share of persons in households where at least one person had to go hungry to bed at least once in the last month, household members (%)	1	Scoreboard	

8..2.	Poverty	Share of Roma children 0-17 living in household where one person in the household gone to bed hungry in the past month because there was not enough money for food (%)	2	NEW	
5.3.	Poverty	Share of Roma living in household that are able to make ends meet with (great) difficulties, household members (%)	2	SWD	Eurostat
5.4.	Poverty	Material deprivation, selected items, eg. cannot afford food, inviting friends, etc.	1	NEW	Eurostat
5.5.	Poverty	Share of Roma who do not have a bank account (%)	2	NEW	Eurostat
5.6	Poverty	Share of Roma who received help or support from a public institution or NGO in the form of financial help/support, respondents, 16+ (%)	2	NEW	
6.1.	Discrimination and Hate Crime	Share of Roma who felt discriminated against because of being Roma in any of all areas covered in the survey in the past 12 months, respondents, 16+ (%)	1	SWD	SDG 10.3
6.2.	Discrimination and Hate Crime	Share of Roma experiencing hate-motivated harassment (overall-5 acts) because of being Roma in the 12 months before the survey, respondents, 16+ (%):	2	SWD	SDG 10.3
6.3.	Discrimination and Hate Crime	Share of Roma who were physically attacked because of being Roma (out of all respondents) in the past 12 months, respondents, 16+ (%):	2	SWD	SDG relevant
6.4.	Discrimination and Hate Crime	Share of Roma who were stopped by police in the past 12 months and they think they were stopped because of being Roma, respondents, 16+ (%)	2	SWD	
6.5	Discrimination and Hate Crime	Share of general population who do not feel comfortable with having Roma as their neighbour/ Share of people who do not feel comfortable to have Roma married into their family (Fundamental Rights Survey)	2	NEW	
6.6	Discrimination and Hate Crime	Share of people who find it acceptable to not hire a Roma because of concerns how customers might react (Fundamental Rights survey)	2	NEW	
6.9	Discrimination and Hate Crime	Share of general population who would feel comfortable with Roma as a colleagues at workplace (Eurobarometer)	2	NEW	Eurobarometer

6.11.	Discrimination and Hate Crime	Share of general population who would feel comfortable with Roma as classmates of one's children (Eurobarometer)	2	NEW	Eurobarometer
7.1.	Rights awareness & trust	Share of Roma who did NOT report the most recent incident of harassment because of being Roma (of those experiencing harassment), respondents, 16+ (%)	2	SWD	
7.2.	Rights awareness & trust	Share of Roma who felt discriminated against and NOT reported the last incident of discrimination because of being Roma, respondents, 16+ (%)	1	SWD	
7.3.	Rights awareness & trust	Share of Roma who NOT reported the most recent incident of physical attack because of being Roma, respondents, 16+ (%)	2	SWD	
7.4.	Rights awareness & trust	Share of Roma who heard of at least one equality body, respondents, 16+ (%)	1	SWD	
7.6.	Rights awareness & trust	Share of Roma who are aware of a law that forbids discrimination, respondents, 16+ (%)	2	SWD	
7.7.	Rights awareness & trust	Share of Roma who tend to trust the police and/or the judicial system, respondents, 16+ (%) to be developed	2	NEW	Eurostat - only 2013
7.9	Rights awareness & trust	Share of Roma who feel attached (very) strongly to Europe / country of residence / village/town/city, respondents, 16+ (%) to be developed	2	NEW	Eurobarometer collects annually attachment to city, country, EU; it has 4 response categories, EU MIDIS II has a 5 level scale
8.1.	Rights awareness & trust	Early marriage: Share of Roma who got married before the age of 18.	2	NEW	

5. Questions for discussion with the participants

Participants are invited to provide their comments regarding the following questions:

<u>Process indicators</u>

1) Do the 'process' indicators in the reporting tool adequately capture the Roma inclusion efforts of Member States?
2) How could the reporting tool be improved?

<u>Outcome indicators</u>

1) Please provide your view on the headline and secondary 'outcome' indicators and which you would suggest to drop or add?
2) What would you suggest as an appropriate indicator to capture anti-Gypsyism?

Additional written comments can be sent to JUST-ROMA-POST-2020@ec.europa.eu until the end of October 2019.